

Safety Evaluation Number¹: SE-W375-00-00002 Revision No: 0

ABCN Number: ABCN-W375-00-00003

Safety Evaluation Subject: Credit for Facility Worker Evacuation

PART I: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED REVISION, BACKGROUND, AND SCHEDULE

1. Describe the proposed revision (including credible failure modes, if applicable).

Explicitly allow credit for administrative controls (including evacuation) to protect facility workers, when appropriate, even without engineered controls (i.e., SSCs).
2. Identify the affected Authorization Basis (AB) documents and perform a comparison and assessment of the revision against the AB.

SRD Vol. II Appendix A, section 5.0, and SRD Vol. II Appendix B, sections 2.6 and 3.0 provide criteria for development of control strategies, including administrative controls.
3. List the references used for the safety evaluation.

BNFL-5193-SRD-01, Rev. 2e, *TWRS-P Project Safety Requirements Document*, Vol. II, January 18, 2000, BNFL Inc., Richland, WA
4. Describe the planned revision implementation schedule.

Revised pages of the AB documents (including revision pages) will be submitted to the RU within 14 days following RU approval. The amendment will be fully implemented within 30 days (i.e., modifications to controlled copies of the AB and subordinate documents).

PART II: REGULATORY IMPACT OF PROPOSED AB REVISION

The following questions are to be answered as part of the safety evaluation, to determine if the proposed AB revision (and the proposed initiating change if applicable) requires prior RU approval.

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Does the revision involve the deletion or modification of a standard previously identified or established in the approved SRD? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| JUSTIFICATION: | | |
| This revision proposes to modify SRD Vol. II, Appendices A and B, which are implementing standards to explicitly credit administrative controls (e.g., evacuation) in control strategies that protect facility workers. | | |
| 2. Does the revision result in a reduction in commitment currently described in the AB? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| JUSTIFICATION: | | |
| This revision reduces the commitment to include SSCs in control strategies that protect | | |

¹ The Safety Evaluation Number shall be obtained from Project Document Control.

Safety Evaluation Number¹: SE-W375-00-00002 Revision No: 0

ABCN Number: ABCN-W375-00-00003

Safety Evaluation Subject: Credit for Facility Worker Evacuation

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
facility workers. SRD Vol. II Appendix A, section 5.0, and SRD Vol. II Appendix B, sections 2.6 and 3.0, provide criteria for development of control strategies, including administrative controls.		

3. Does the revision result in a reduction in the effectiveness of any program, procedure, or plan described in the AB. ☐ ☒

JUSTIFICATION:

The revision does not involve a change to any program, procedure, or plan described in the AB.

Note: Guidance on defining the terms and responding to the above questions is provided in K70C528, Code of Practice for Managing Changes to the Authorization Basis, Appendix 6.

If all the answers to the above questions are no, then the change can be made without prior RU approval.

If any of the above answers is yes, then RU approval is required prior to implementation of the AB revision (and the initiating change if applicable). An ABAR shall be prepared to obtain RU approval (see K70C528, Appendix 7.)

PART III: SAFETY EVALUATION CONCLUSION

- ☐ All PART II questions are answered No. Therefore, RU approval is NOT required prior to implementing the proposed AB revision (and initiating change where applicable).
- ☒ At least one PART II question is answered Yes. Therefore, RU approval IS required prior to implementing the proposed AB revision (and initiating change where applicable). Issuance of an ABAR is required to obtain RU approval.

Evaluator/Originator

Date

Reviewer²

Date

Manager, Safety and Regulatory Programs

Date

² The reviewer should be a person from the same department as the Evaluator/Originator and at least as qualified as the Evaluator/Originator to conduct safety evaluations.